

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Prior to this Submission, Claims 1-10 are pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 7 being written in independent form. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,147 to *Barnes et al.* (hereinafter *Barnes*) in view of the Gustafsson reference from Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement (hereinafter *Gustafsson*). The Examiner rejected Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barnes* in view of *Gustafsson* and U.S. Patent No. 6,735,187 to *Helander et al.* (hereinafter *Helander*).

Please add new Claims 11 and 12 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-12 are currently pending in this application.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-6, the Examiner maintained the contention that *Barnes* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1, except for upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, said Agent Advertisement message being transmitted by the first GGSN, and transmitting by the second GGSN a location information message to the home agent. The Examiner cited *Gustafsson* to cure these deficiencies. It is respectfully asserted that the Examiner is incorrect.

As similarly asserted in the Response dated July 27, 2006 Applicant strongly asserts that the Examiner incorrectly alleged that *Barnes* (in column 14, lines 33-36) teaches transmitting the location registration request from the first GGSN to the second GGSN, at least because the cited passage and text of *Barnes* states, "At step 514, the new

GSN/FA 284 sends a modified mobile IP+ Registration Request message to the GSN/HA 254 to update its registration location information. At step 516, the GSN/HA 254 sends a MAP + Registration Reply message back to the GSN/FA 284.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner’s allegation in the rejection that these lines teach, “Transmits registration request to the old GSN/FA” is incorrect, since the request is transmitted to the GSN/HA, which the Examiner equates with the home agent in Claim 1. Also, since in the same rejection the Examiner cited the new GSN/FA in *Barnes* as reading on the second GGSN in Claim 1, it cannot now read on the first GGSN in Claim 1. Likewise, the GSN/HA in *Barnes* was cited by the Examiner in the same rejection as reading on a home agent in Claim 1; it cannot now read on the second GGSN in Claim 1.

Worse yet, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleged that the lines at issue (i.e., col.14, lns. 33-36) in *Barnes* teach the recitation at issue in Claim 1, since “Barnes teaches of transmitting a location registration from a first node to a second node.” The Examiner further alleged that, “the claimed GGSNs are merely nodes functioning as a FA or FGA, thus a FA node or a GFA node.” The Examiner never made these allegations in the rejection, nor did the Examiner allege any inherency of the claimed first GGSN in *Barnes*’ new GSN/FA, or of the claimed second GGSN in *Barnes*’ GSN/HA. There is no such inherency in these elements in *Barnes*.

The Examiner may have realized that *Barnes* does not teach the recitation at issue, and therefore broadened the scope of the first and second GGSNs in Claim 1 to mere ‘first and second nodes’ in the Response to Arguments. However, the Examiner cannot properly refer to particular first GGSN and second GGSN elements in Claim 1 as mere generic first and second nodes, since Claim 1 specifically states that these elements are Gateway General Packet Radio Service Support Nodes, that the first GGSN serves as a foreign agent for storing location information of the first GGSN, and that the second

GGSN stores location information of the first GGSN. Contrary to the Examiner's Response to Arguments, these are respective GGSN functions.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Barnes* does not teach transmitting the location registration request from the first GGSN to the second GGSN, as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, transmitting a location registration request from the mobile node to the first GGSN, upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, said Agent Advertisement message being transmitted by the first GGSN.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, receiving through the created GTP tunnel an Agent Advertisement message indicating whether a second GGSN serves as the foreign agent or the gateway foreign agent.

With regard to these respective recitations in Claims 1 and 7, however, it is respectfully asserted that *Gustafsson* merely teaches using FAs or GFAs. This is in sharp contrast to indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, as recited in Claim 1, and indicating whether a second GGSN serves as the foreign agent or the gateway foreign agent, as recited in Claim 7. As previously stated regarding the Examiner's Response to Argument that the claimed GGSNs are merely nodes functioning as a FA or FGA, thus a FA node or a GFA node, the Examiner never made these allegations in the rejection, nor did the Examiner allege any inherency of the claimed first and second GGSNs anywhere in *Barnes*. There is no such inherency in these elements in *Barnes*.

Moreover, since *Gustafsson* merely teaches using FAs and GFAs, as such, there

would be no reason to receive an Agent Advertisement message with information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, as recited in Claim 1. Likewise, there would be no reason to indicate whether a second GGSN serves as the foreign agent or the gateway foreign agent, as recited in Claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Barnes* nor *Gustafsson*, either alone or in combination thereof, teaches or suggests each and every limitation of Claim 1, and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1-6 should thus be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

For at least the same reasons, and further since *Helander* fails to cure the stated deficiencies in *Barnes* and *Gustafsson*, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 7-10 is also respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 7 11 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-12, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the printed name.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475
PJF/RCC/dr